

**Department of Elementary and Secondary Education**  
**Special Education Monitoring Self-Assessment (SEMSA)**

**Report Summary**

**MSIP Year: 2002-2003**

Total Number of Surveys:	Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC)			
Role of Person completing this survey:	Heart of Missouri-Columbia:	1	South Central Missouri:	3
Special Education Contact: 48	Southwest Missouri:	16	Southeast Missouri:	0
Superintendent: 3	Kansas City:	3	St. Louis:	2
Principal: 3	Northeast Missouri:	0	Central Missouri:	5
Other: 3	Northwest Missouri:	3		

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<b>A. TRAINING/TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE</b>					
1. SEMSA training workshops were helpful.	20	31	6	0	0
2. DESE provided timely and helpful responses to questions.	21	27	1	7	1
3. Compliance List Serv was helpful in answering questions.	8	23	17	8	1
<b>B. WRITTEN INSTRUCTIONS</b>					
4. SEMSA instruction guidelines were helpful.	7	47	1	2	0
5. SEMSA instruction guidelines were user friendly.	5	43	3	4	2
<b>C. SELF-ASSESSMENT PROCESS</b>					
6. Data required to complete the self-monitoring review was easily accessible.	12	36	4	4	1
7. Amount of time required to complete the review was reasonable.	1	28	4	15	9
8. Electronic submission of data is an efficient way to send SEMSA data to DESE.	23	21	7	3	3
9. SEMSA process increased understanding of compliance requirements for special education.	19	31	3	3	1
10. SEMSA process is an effective way to assess student performance for students w/ disabilities.	2	21	8	18	8
11. SEMSA process has made district/agency more aware of performance of students w/disabilities.	3	26	10	13	5
12. SEMSA process helped accurately evaluate performance of students w/ disabilities.	0	19	12	19	7
13. SEMSA process is an effective way to assess compliance with state/federal regulations.	18	33	3	1	2
14. Time spent on the SEMSA process was beneficial.	8	27	12	5	5
<b>D. FINAL REPORT AND LETTER</b>					
15. Received final monitoring report/letter in reasonable length of time.	6	21	7	11	12
16. Final report/letter were user friendly.	5	27	14	8	3
<b>E. CORRECTIVE ACTION/IMPROVEMENT PLANNING</b>					
17. District/agency is aware of its areas of non-compliance.	19	28	8	1	1
18. District/agency is aware of what it needs to do to correct any areas of non-compliance.	18	25	7	5	5
<b>F. ON-SITE PREPARATION AND VISIT</b>					
19. Preparation for the on-site monitoring accomplished in reasonable amount of time.	0	13	5	5	3
20. On-site monitoring was beneficial.	5	13	7	0	1
21. On-site monitoring conducted in an efficient and effective manner.	8	10	8	1	0
22. DESE staff conducting on-site monitoring were knowledgeable.	13	8	6	0	0
23. DESE staff conducting on-site monitoring were professional.	12	6	7	1	0
24. DESE staff conducting the on-site monitoring were helpful.	12	5	8	1	0

25. How many staff were involved in the SEMSA self-monitoring review process?

Special Educators: 549      Administrators: 106      Support Staff: 78      Others: 45

26. How many total hours did it take to complete the SEMSA Review and Reporting:

Less than 20 hours: 2      21 to 30 hours: 11      31 to 40 hours: 15      More than 40 hours: 29

27. Did staff request assistance from a DESE special education Compliance supervisor during the SEMSA process?

Yes 45      No 12

*Questions 28-31 are addressed on a separate report.*